

SS: 2190

JPRS: 4194

16 November 1960

IS THIS DIALECTICAL MATERIALISM OR "CYCLICAL THEORY" ?

By Ch'iao Lin

- COMMUNIST CHINA -

TO MAIN FILE

**DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A**  
Approved for Public Release  
Distribution Unlimited

19990729 072

Reproduced From  
Best Available Copy

This material, translated under U.S. Government auspices, is distributed for scholarly uses to repository libraries under a grant/subscription arrangement with the Joint Committee on Contemporary China of the American Council of Learned Societies and the Social Science Research Council. The contents of this material in no way represent the policies, views, or attitudes of the U.S. Government or the other parties to the arrangement. Queries regarding participation in this arrangement should be addressed to the Social Science Research Council, 230 Park Avenue, New York 17, New York.

U. S. JOINT PUBLICATIONS RESEARCH SERVICE  
1636 CONNECTICUT AVE., N. W.  
WASHINGTON 25, D. C.

JPRS: 4194

CSO: 1095-S/c

IS THIS DIALECTICAL MATERIALISM OR "CYCLICAL THEORY" ?

- A discussion with Mr. P'ing Hsin concerning the  
problem of the nature of productive forces -

- COMMUNIST CHINA -

[The following is the translation of an article written  
by Ch'iao Lin entitled "Shih Pien Cheng Wei Wu Lun Huan  
Shih 'Hsin Huan Lun'" ? (English version above) in  
Kwang-ming Jih-pao, Peiping, 8 August 1960, page 3]

Mr. P'ing Hsin has published several articles concerning the  
problem of the nature of productive forces persistently expounding  
his views.

In his article entitled "Fourth Discussion on the Nature of  
Productive Forces", he said: "on the problem concerning productive  
forces and relations of production, like any other theoretical problems,  
I am forever a student of Marxism-Leninism and the writings of Mao  
Tse-tung. Concerning the theses that I have expounded.....I think  
all earnest and thoughtful persons would have deduced views similar  
to mine." ("Hsueh Shu Yieh K'an" (Academic Monthly), No. 5, 1960,  
page 42)

Soon after this, he began to have certain doubts about his own views in his article "Statement Concerning Several Problems on the Nature of Productive Forces." He said: "I have brought out a few problems and also expressed some immature views. Have I erred in proposing these problems? Have my views on these problems been correct? This can not be judged through my own study and analysis,.....should my proposal of these problems be found inapt and my views groundless, I would cast them aside like a rotten tooth without hesitation."

("Hsueh Shu Yüeh K'ian", No. 4, 1960, page 18)

If Mr. P'ing Hsin's theses are correctly based upon Marxism-Leninism, how can they be turned into a castoff in the process of discussion? Can truth be transformed into antitheses through discussion?

In fact, Mr. P'ing Hsin has not really admitted his own theoretical errors. Recently he again published an article in Hsin Chien Shue (New Construction) entitled "On Contradictory Movement of Productive Forces and Relations of Production", i.e. his "Fifth Discussion on the Nature of Productive Forces." In this article, he still persisted in his erroneous theory and accused those comrades who had discussed with him the problem of the nature of productive forces as dogmatists.

In this article, I only wish to discuss one problem with Mr. P'ing Hsin and invite the criticism of the general readers of this newspaper.

In his "On Contradictory Movement of Productive Forces and Relations of Production," he expounded at length the dialectical

[relation between productive forces and relations of production, but we feel there are several points deserving further analysis. One problem particularly stands out among the others, i.e. the true dialectical relation between productive forces and relations of productions, which, in Mr. P'ing Hsin's view, has become mere "Cyclical Theory". What is this all about?

Marxist theory of historical materialism has taught us that there are two phases to the form of production, i.e. productive forces and relations of production. Productive forces are the base upon which the relations of production develop. The relations of production must develop in conformity with productive forces, but once the relations of production are established, they in turn exert a tremendous effect upon the productive forces. If the relations of production do not conform with the nature of productive forces, the relations of production will hinder the further development of productive forces. To enable the continuous development of productive forces, it is necessary to change the old relations of production and supersede them with new relations of production. At this moment, the new relations of production become the principal and decisive force in determining the further development of productive forces.

In his book "On Contradiction", Chairman Mao told us that we must not look upon all the contradictions in the process as equal. We must differentiate the principal contradiction from the secondary contradictions. In analyzing a problem, we must first grasp the principal contradiction. In any contradiction, whether principal or

secondary, the two aspects of contradiction must not be treated as equal either. Of the two contradictory aspects, one must be the principal and the other secondary.

These valuable guidances are particularly important with regard to uncovering the contradiction between productive forces and relations of production and the mutual transformation of its principal aspects. In accordance with the theory stated in Chairman Mao's "On Contradiction," we have learned that in the life of human society, the contradictions between productive forces and relations of production, between the base and the superstructure are the basic and principal contradictions among all other contradictions. But within the contradiction between productive forces and relations of production, it is generally admitted that productive forces are the principal aspect of the contradiction and relations of production are its secondary aspect.

Chairman Mao also told us that this condition is not rigid and unchangeable, "because the principal and non-principal aspects are continually interchanging,.....during a certain process or at a certain stage in the development of a contradiction, the principal aspect is A and the non-principal aspect is B. At another stage or in another process of development, the roles are reversed....."

( Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung , volume 2, page 789) This also applies to the contradiction between productive forces and relations of production. During one stage of development, productive forces are the principal aspect of the contradiction, but at another stage of development, the relations of production assume the principal aspect.

Chairman Mao said: "True, the productive forces, practice and economic base generally manifest themselves in the principal and decisive role. Whoever does not admit this is not a materialist. But under certain conditions, such aspects as the relations of production, theory and superstructure in turn manifest themselves in the principal and decisive role; this must also be admitted. When the productive forces can not be developed unless the relations of production are changed, the change in the relations of production plays the principal and decisive role.....this is not running counter to materialism; on the contrary, this is avoiding mechanistic materialism and firmly upholding dialectical materialism." ( Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung , volume 2, page 792)

Chairman Mao's theory concerning the principal and decisive role of the relations of production on productive forces under certain conditions -- the theory of counter role of the relations of production --is exactly the revolutionary soul of true dialectical materialism. It is an important development of Marxism-Leninism. Any departure from this theory is equivalent to the removal of the foundation stone of the revolutionary dialectical materialism. We know that the Marxist theory of the inevitable superseding of capitalism by communism was born under the guidance of this revolutionary theory. The great victory of the October Socialist Revolution under the leadership of Lenin was also born under the guidance of this revolutionary theory. It was also under the guidance of this revolutionary theory that Chairman Mao correctly applied this revolutionary theory

to the actual condition in China, led the Chinese people to overthrow the reactionary rule of Chiang Kai-shek, and made it possible for our country to transform from a poor backward semi-feudalistic and semi-colonial society to a great socialist nation.

In his series of articles, Mr. P'ing Hsin obviously has opposed the correct Marxist-Leninist dialectical view of productive forces and relations of production. His view has been that if productive forces are generally the principal and decisive role and generally the most active and revolutionary element, then the role must remain unchanged. Otherwise, it is the "Cyclical Theory".

Mr. P'ing Hsin wrote: "During the process of development in our society, the productive forces and relations of production do not perform parallel roles but constantly manifest the relation between the principal and subordinate. Under certain conditions, this relation may be reversed, but it is the productive forces which are the ultimate and basic force in determining the development of our society, and not the relations of production. To overlook this point of origin and treat the two aspects as completely parallel forces would inevitably fall into the argument of "Cyclical Theory", namely productive forces determine relations of production and relations of production in turn determine productive forces." ("Again on the Nature of Productive Forces", Hsueh Shu Yieh K'an, No. 9, 1959, page 55. Underscore as appeared in original text)

As Mr. P'ing Hsin saw it, even though the time had come that he could not refuse to admit the counter role of relations of production

On productive forces, he still found it necessary to maintain that productive forces assume "counter-counter role" on relations of production. He wrote: "Although productive forces are regulated and affected in many ways by the counter role of relations of production, once their distinctive characteristics emerge, they will combine and form a relatively independent system of movement, which become not only the internal strength in motivating the development of productive forces themselves, but also become the objective strength motivating the development of relations of production. It is altogether incorrect to see only the counter role of relations of production on productive forces but overlook the decisive role and counter-counter role of productive forces on relations of production." ("Third Discussion on the Nature of Productive Forces", Hsüeh Shu Yüeh K'an, No. 12, 1959, page 46) How can there be any similarity between Mr. P'ing Hsin's theory and dialectical materialism?

Mr. P'ing Hsin not only "criticized" the so called "Cyclical Theory" but also pointed out a way for us, which is recognition of his theory concerning the internal contradiction of productive forces, i.e. the "Dual Character of Productive Forces."

Now, let us examine exactly what is Mr. P'ing Hsin's theory of "Dual Character of Productive Forces."

Firstly, Mr. P'ing Hsin was not satisfied with the viewpoint of dialectical materialism and wished to search for another determining factor in the development of productive forces. Therefore, he posed the following problem: "Aside from the contradiction between productive



[ forces and relations of production<sup>1</sup> and the motivating role of relations of production, is there still another internal cause for the propagation of productive forces"? or "Internal force"? (Hsieh Shu Yieh K'an, No. 9, 1959, page 54 and No. 3, 1960, page 48) ]

+ Mr. P'ing Hsin made an extensive study of those "conditions and causes regulating and affecting productive forces." In order to prevent us from being "lost in a maze" in the very complex inter-relations of the various causes governing productive forces, he further attempted to uncover the principal contradiction existing in these relations. He discovered the "Dual Character of Productive Forces", i.e. "Material and Technical Character" and "Social Character" of productive forces.

For the moment, let us not delve into the content of this "Material and Technical Character" and "Social Character" because to do so will lead us away from the principal problem at hand in this article. (The writer agrees with the opinion of a number of comrades who pointed out in their articles that Mr. P'ing Hsin's so called social character actually embodies a portion of relations of production. Owing to limited space, the writer will not attempt to discuss this with Mr. P'ing Hsin at length in this article. Later, this writer will point out that Mr. P'ing Hsin, by refusing to admit that his social character embodies relations of production, has ensnared his theory in the depth of absurdity!)

Ever since Mr. P'ing Hsin discovered this dual character of productive forces, the unity of opposites movement of this dual ]

character of productive forces has led him further astray. From there, he completely departed from the afore-mentioned true dialectical relation between productive forces and relations of production, especially, the counter role of relations of production on productive forces.

Mr. P'ing Hsin believes that he has discovered the secret of self-propagation of productive forces. (although he talked about the propagation within definite relations of production) He said: "The dual character of productive forces exists in all social conditions. The material and technical character of productive forces matures within certain social economic structure but generally later than its social character. However, that does not mean the latter reaches a rigid form from the start. It also follows the growth of society's production and develops gradually and ceaselessly. However, the imbalance of the dual character of productive forces has always been the important characteristic of the movement of the society's productive forces. Only when the material and technical standard has been raised to a definite level, will there be the appearance of a counter-balance, but with the continuous growth of productive forces, (or degeneration under certain conditions) the balance is once again disrupted. By passing through another stage of development, the counter-balance can again be established." ("Again on the Nature of Productive Forces", Hsüeh Shu Yieh K'an, No. 9, 1959, page 56)

After Mr. P'ing Hsin has led us through his unity of opposites movement of the dual character of productive forces, he concluded

arbitrarily: "Although the contradiction of the dual character of productive forces and its solution are the principal cause in motivating the development of productive forces, it is not the only cause. Aside from the expediting and transferring role of relations of production on productive forces, the internal cause of the development of productive forces is quite intricate and requires further penetrating and thorough analysis." ("Again on the Nature of Productive Forces", Hsüeh Shu Yüeh K'an, No. 9, 1959, page 57)

Here, Mr. P'ing Hsin brought out simultaneously the dual character of productive forces and the decisive role of the relations of production on productive forces, and put them on a "equal" basis. In fact, he is taking his first step in the wrong direction.

The inevitable result of developing Mr. P'ing Hsin's logic one step further is the distortion of the counter role of the relations of production on productive forces. He said: "We can not consider the counter role of the relations of production as the only decisive role in the development of productive forces. Neither can we consider the contradiction between productive forces and relations of production as the only motivating force causing change in productive forces. Otherwise, it would be just like transplanting the vision of perpetual motion machine, which is contrary to the law of mass and energy, from the realm of physics to the realm of social science." ("Third Discussion on the Nature of Productive Forces", Hsüeh Shu Yüeh K'an, No. 12, 1959, page 52)

After concluding this criticism, Mr. P'ing Hsin introduced

his dual character of productive forces and said: "The possibility of productive forces propagating by themselves is determined by their internal contradiction." (Quotation from the same source as above. Underscored as appearing in original text)

Although Mr. P'ing Hsin has never ceased to argue that he did not abandon the role of relations of production and has insisted that self-propagation of productive forces and their dual character take place within definite relations of production, but this is only a pretext. In fact, ever since the emergence of the dual character of productive forces and their movement of contradictions, there remains only an empty shell for the so called relations of production. The revolutionary content of relations of production has been disembowelled following the disappearance of the counter role of relations of production on productive forces. For this reason, the "Dual Character of Productive Forces" has become the most important pillar supporting Mr. P'ing Hsin's erroneous theory. Therefore, it is only natural that Mr. P'ing Hsin said: "The iron logic of social economic life is so strong and powerful that every serious-minded person can not escape from the axis of contradiction within the realm of productive forces and relations of production, namely the dual character of productive forces." (Quotation from same source as above, page 53)

The above statement can be better interpreted as follows:

All those who are willing to negate the counter role of relations of production like Mr. P'ing Hsin absolutely can not dismiss such an

axis of contradiction: the dual character of productive forces.

Mr. P'ing Hsin is convinced that his theory concerning the role of dual character of productive forces in determining the growth of productive forces is universally applicable. Hence, it can explain not only the problem of our national socialist construction, but also point a way out for the capitalist-imperialist countries: Although the relations of production play a counter role on productive forces, the possibility of growth of productive forces is principally determined by their internal contradictions. The reason is that "within the economic conditions of a society, the growth of certain causes and conditions of productive forces coupled with the retardation of other causes and conditions would form and intensify the internal contradictions of productive forces, which can only be resolved by strengthening the retarded causes and conditions enabling them to catch up or basically catch up with the progressive causes and conditions. Progress of productive forces takes place within the process of endless emergences and solutions of these internal contradictions, which are the movement of contradictions of productive forces, i.e. the movement of self-propagation of productive forces within relations of production." ("Fourth Discussion on the Nature of Productive Forces", Hsdeh Shai Yüeh K'ian, No. 3, 1960, page 49) Therefore, through apt adjustment of the relation between the technical character and social character of productive forces and adjustment of the contradictions between them, every problem can be solved; productive forces can undergo substantial development; "self-propagation" of productive forces will take place.

[within relations of production; capitalist system will live ever after. On the basis of Mr. P'ing Hsin's theory, change of the social character of productive forces need not be dreaded because he has emphasized repeatedly that the social character of productive forces does not belong within the limits of relations of production. Anyone who reasons to the contrary is propounding "heresy" (?) !

Mr. P'ing Hsin has looked upon "internal contradictions of productive forces" as "the principal determinant of the growth of productive forces". He has insisted upon that this is materialist dialectics and is opposed to the dogmatists. He said that all those comrades who discussed the dual character of productive forces with him "were satisfied with the cyclical theory of productive forces determine relations of production and relations of production in turn determine productive forces because they had not admitted the existence of internal contradictions within productive forces."

("Third Discussion on the Nature of Productive Forces," Hsiieh Shu Yüeh K'ien, No. 12, 1959, page 52)

Productive forces determine relations of production, and relations of production under definite conditions determine productive forces. This is the principle of Marxist-Leninist dialectical materialism. To call it "Cyclical Theory" is undoubtedly a serious distortion of Marxism-Leninism.

Marxist-Leninist has always used the principle of reciprocal role between productive forces and relations of production to explain the main spring of the tremendous growth of productive forces in the

society. Whenever new relations of production appeared in history, this new relations of production constituted the principal determining force for the further advancement of productive forces at that time, and it was not the result of what Mr. P'ing Hsin has described as the movement of contradictions of the dual character of productive forces.

Marx and Engels, in their discussion of the role of the early stage of the emergence of capitalist relations of production on the development of productive forces, said like this: "The ruling class position of the bourgeoisie has not yet reached one hundred years, but the productive forces created by it are far greater than the total aggregate of productive forces of all the generations before that."

( Marx-Engels Selected Works , volume 1, page 15)

Of course, the development of capitalist relations of production must be established upon definite foundation of productive forces. It is not incorrect that Mr. P'ing Hsin should propose the following problem. He said: "If during the latter period of European feudal society, there was no definite accumulation of productive forces (human labor and material labor), no definite division of labor, no means of transportation, no definite degree of currency economy and commodity economy arisen from these social material conditions, no definite contribution of free labor, could there be the emergence and growth of capitalist form of production?" ("Fifth Discussion on the Nature of Productive Forces", Hsin Chien She, No. 6, 1960, page 32)

However, dialectical materialist must not dwell only upon this side of the problem. He must also examine the other side: If without the development of capitalist relations of production (it also includes Mr. P'ing Hsin's problem of "contribution of free labor") could capitalist productive forces develop to such a great extent? Wasn't the great development of capitalist productive forces at that time an expression of the great role played by capitalist relations of production in history?

Marx and Engels said: "The bourgeoisie had performed an exceptionally revolutionary role in history." "Wherever the bourgeoisie reached the ruling position, it has eliminated all the feudalistic, ancestral and traditional relations. It has mercilessly severed all those complex feudalistic trappings which had bound the people to their "natural seniority". It has divested the people of all human relations except those naked gain-loss relations, and cold emotionless "cash barter".....It has transformed the human value to exchange value. It has superseded all those countless special privileges and hardearned freedom with a heartless free enterprise. To sum it up, it has replaced the exploitation shielded by religious and political vision with open, shameless, cruel and direct exploitation." ( Marx-Engels Selected Works , volume 1, page 11)

Doesn't this explain quite clearly that the productive forces of capitalist society achieved great development only when the feudalistic relations of production has been replaced by capitalist relations of production?"



During the process of bourgeois revolution, the capitalist relations of production have not remained fixed since their emergence as some people incline to believe. In the Capital, Marx analyzed in great detail the three stages of development of capitalist production: capitalist simple cooperative production, capitalist handicraft industries and capitalist large-scale industries. In analyzing the stages of development of capitalist productive forces, Marx also clarified that they were the stages of development of relations of production.

For example, the labor productivity of capitalist simple cooperative production was undoubtedly much higher than that of the feudal handicraft workshop, but without the introduction of capitalist relations of production, it would have been impossible to develop the relatively higher productive forces of simple cooperative production. Marx said: "If the workers are not gathered together in one place, it is generally impossible to obtain direct cooperative production. Therefore, to get the workers together in a definite place is a prerequisite for their cooperative production. Wage earners can not enter into cooperative production, unless there is one capital and one capitalist to employ them and to purchase their labor at the same time." (Capital, volume 1, page 394)

In the Communist Manifesto, Marx and Engels wrote: "The bourgeoisie can not sustain its existence unless it enforce constant changes in tools of production, relations of production and revolutionizes the entire relations of the society.....constant changes in

[production, continuous upheaval in all social relations, constant unrest and change --- these are the characteristics which differentiate the bourgeois period from all previous periods in history." ( Marx-Engels Selected Works , volume 1, page 12)

Of course, the capitalist relations of production belong to the system of private ownership, and when the productive forces have been fully developed and entered into contradiction with the existing relations of production, the bourgeoisie has continued actively to consolidate its ruling position, and thereby impeded and restricted further development of productive forces. Only by overthrowing capitalism and establish socialist relations of production, the productive forces can then advance another stage forward in their development.

Under the socialist system, we must thoroughly eliminate class and exploitation from our economy and political ideology, and thereby, the dialectics between productive forces and relations of production can be consciously applied by the people enabling the socialist productive forces to eliminate any crisis, upheaval and carry on their high-speed development.

Chairman Mao has summed up the experience of socialist construction and developed Marxism-Leninism under new conditions. He has pointed out that under socialist system the contradictions between productive forces and relations of production, between base and superstructure are still the basic contradictions in our society. He further pointed out that such contradictions existing under socialist system are

different from those under capitalist system because these contradictions can be resolved continuously through socialist system itself. (Please refer to "On the Correct Handling of Contradictions among the People")

Under the correct ideological guidance of Mao Tse-tung, China's socialist revolution and socialist construction have scored a well-known and glorious victory. The rapid development of China's productive forces and the great leap forward in recent years are the result of our people's continuous solution of the contradictions between productive forces and relations of production, between superstructure and economic base under the correct leadership of our Party's Central Committee and Chairman Mao. The continuous revolution and development of our relations of production is the principal and determining force in the spectacular development of our productive forces.

In his "The Victory of Marxism-Leninism in China", Comrade Liu Shao-chi wrote: "The socialist system is not rigid and unchangeable. Under correct leadership, the transformation of old program and the establishment of new program are the total manifestation and development of the superiority of the socialist system. To accomplish this, we must depend upon the people to struggle against all the traditions and forces of habit restricting the development of productive forces, to adjust continuously the relations of production and superstructure adapting them to the needs of development of productive forces in our society. "If we do this, we can impel the rapid development of

the technological reform and revolution, the rapid development of productive forces in our society, and maintain the continuous leaping forward of our national economy." ( Red Flag , No. 19, 1959, page 11-12)

Mr. P'ing Hsin's proposal of his theory that the contradiction of the "Dual Character of Productive Forces" is the principal motive force for the development of productive forces obviously does not conform with the Marxist-Leninist doctrine.

Please refer to Mr. P'ing Hsin's "Fifth Discussion on the Nature of Productive Forces" appeared in Hsin Chien She , in which he still maintained: "Obviously, the cause for the most active and revolutionary manifestation of productive forces in production can not be found in the relations of production, nor can it be found completely in the contradiction between productive forces and relations of production.....If we follow the views of the theory of absolute relations of production or cyclical theory and look upon the relations of production or the contradiction between productive forces as the perpetual battery of productive forces, we can not explain the problem of resource and source of energy for the growth of productive forces. The result would be just like what I said before : 'the transfer of vision of perpetual motion machine, which is contrary to the law of mass and energy, from the realm of physics to the realm of social science.'"

It is quite obvious that Mr. P'ing Hsin's theory is contrary to Marxism-Leninism.

The first sentence of Mr. P'ing Hsin's "Fifth Discussion on the Nature of Productive Forces" stated: "We must persist in the principle of unity of theory and practice in our study of the problems between productive forces and relations of production, between super-structure and base."

This is a very sound statement, but which is the one departing from practice? Is it the Marxist-Leninist dialectical view of the productive forces and relations of production or Mr. P'ing Hsin's theory of the "Dual Character of Productive Forces?" If we respect the practical experience of our people's socialist revolution and socialist construction, we would discover that the entire experience of our country has proved the complete correctness of Marxism-Leninism.

Let us review an example. On page 7 of Jen-min Jih-pao, 2 July 1960, there appeared an article written by the Chinese Communist Joint Committee of Peking People's Lamp Factory entitled "'Triple Unity' is a Good Way of Handling the Internal Contradictions within an Enterprise." After reading this article, we learned that in two years, as a result of conscious application of Mao Tse-tung ideology, correct handling of the internal contradiction between relations of production and productive forces within the enterprise especially the "Triple Unity" organizational form, the Peking People's Lamp Factory has been able to continuously improve and perfect the already established socialist relations of production, expedite the rapid development of production, and greatly increase productive forces. In the short period of two years, this factory has transformed from a hammer-scissor type of

["handicraft workshop" to a semi-mechanized factory with its net worth increased by fifteen times.]

What is the practical experience of this factory? The article said: "How is this leaping transformation accomplished? We believe it is the result of our complete adherence to the guidance of Chairman Mao's theory of correct handling of contradictions among the people, our earnest application of the guidance of top-level party committee, persist in our spirit of moral rectification, application of "Triple Unity" organizational form, continuous adjustment of the relations between supervisory cadres, workers and technical personnel, and continuous correct handling of the internal contradictions within the enterprise."

It went on to say: "Chairman Mao said: 'After solution of the problem of ownership, the socialist relations of production have been established and it is mutually adaptable with productive forces; but it is still quite imperfect, and these imperfect aspects are contradictory to the development of productive forces. Aside from the mutually adaptable and simultaneously contradictory condition between relations of production and productive forces, there is still the mutually adaptable and simultaneously contradictory condition between superstructure and economic base.' This conclusive statement is perfectly applicable to our people's lamp factory.....After solution of the problem of ownership, our relations of production has been adapted to the nature of productive forces in all principal aspects enabling rapid development of production. But there are still some aspects which have not

been adapted, such as the capitalist method of management relying upon the minority for management control, the bourgeois inclination of relying upon the few for closed-door research, which are the remnants of the capitalist society and are incongruous with the nature of socialist enterprise. These incongruous aspects impeded further high-speed development of productive forces.....Through the form of "Triple Unity" and other forms, we consciously followed the socialist principle in adjusting the relations between supervisory cadres, workers and technical personnel and thereby gradually eliminated the remnants of capitalism and enabled the communist elements to gradually develop.....Therefore, 'Triple Unity' is not only a powerful weapon for the development of production, impelling technological revolutionary movement, and a concrete method for more-quicker-better-thriftier development of production, but also is an excellent form for the gradual transition of the human relations within our enterprise toward communism."

It looks as if the leaders and workers of Peking People's Lamp Factory did not understand Mr. P'ing Hsin's theory of "Dual Character of Productive Forces" and therefore unable to apply his "Theory" in guiding production. On the contrary, they appeared to be 100% followers of Mr. P'ing Hsin's so called "Cyclical Theory" because they merely followed the ideological guidance of Chairman Mao, applied the principle that relations of production must adapt to the nature of productive forces, through the form of "Triple Unity" consciously adjusted the relations of production and achieved the leaping

[development of production. What would Mr. P'ing Hsin say about this? ]

We are convinced that our argument with Mr. P'ing Hsin is not meaningless. How to treat the problem of contradiction between productive forces and relations of production both in theory and practice; how to correctly recognize these contradictions is a problem of grave concern to the nation's economic construction. It will directly affect the speed of our socialist construction. Therefore, we can not afford to remain silent. We must hold high Mao Tse-tung's ideological red flag and continue our victorious march forward.



FOR REASONS OF SPEED AND ECONOMY  
THIS REPORT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED  
ELECTRONICALLY DIRECTLY FROM OUR  
CONTRACTOR'S TYPESCRIPT

THIS PUBLICATION WAS PREPARED UNDER CONTRACT TO THE  
UNITED STATES JOINT PUBLICATIONS RESEARCH SERVICE  
A FEDERAL GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION ESTABLISHED  
TO SERVICE THE TRANSLATION AND RESEARCH NEEDS  
OF THE VARIOUS GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS

## SUBSCRIBING REPOSITORIES

University of British Columbia  
Vancouver 8, Canada

Center for Chinese Studies  
University of California  
Berkeley 4, California

University of California Library  
Berkeley 4, California

University of Chicago Library  
Chicago 37, Illinois

Librarian, East Asiatic Library  
Columbia University  
New York 27, New York

Council on Foreign Relations  
58 East 68th Street  
New York 21, New York

Duke University Library  
Durham, North Carolina

The Fletcher School of  
Law and Diplomacy  
Tufts University  
Medford, Massachusetts

Harvard College Library  
Cambridge 38, Massachusetts

Center for East Asian Studies  
Harvard University  
16 Dunster Street  
Cambridge 38, Massachusetts

Harvard-Yenching Institute  
Cambridge 38, Massachusetts

University of Hawaii  
Honolulu 14, Hawaii

The Hoover Institution  
Stanford, California

University of Illinois Library  
Urbana, Illinois

Indiana University Library  
Bloomington, Indiana

State University of Iowa Library  
Iowa City, Iowa

Director, East Asian Institute  
Columbia University  
433 West 117th Street  
New York 27, N.Y.

University of San Francisco  
San Francisco 17, California

Institute for Asian Studies  
Marquette University  
Milwaukee 3, Wisconsin

University of Michigan Library  
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Michigan State University Lib.  
East Lansing, Michigan

University of Minnesota Library  
Minneapolis 14, Minnesota

Ohio State University Libraries  
1858 Neil Avenue  
Columbus 10, Ohio

University of Oregon Library  
Eugene, Oregon

University of Pittsburgh Lib.  
Pittsburgh 13, Pennsylvania

Princeton University Library  
Princeton, New Jersey

University of Rochester  
Rochester 20, New York

Institute of Asian Studies  
St. John's University Graduate School  
Jamaica 32, New York

McKissick Memorial Library  
University of South Carolina  
Columbia 1, South Carolina

University of Southern Calif. Library  
Los Angeles 7, California

University of Texas Library  
Austin 12, Texas

Alderman Library  
University of Virginia  
Charlottesville, Virginia

Far Eastern Library  
University of Washington  
Seattle 5, Washington

Yale University Library  
New Haven, Connecticut

Asia Library  
University of Michigan  
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Research Institute,  
Sino-Soviet Bloc  
P.O. Box 3521  
Washington 7, D. C.